



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,723	05/02/2006	Michael Wind	289241US0PCT	3163
22850 7590 12/28/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER GILLESPIE, BENJAMIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/28/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/577,723

Applicant(s)

WIND ET AL.

Examiner

BENJAMIN J. GILLESPIE

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Note

1. In view of applicants' remarks filed 8/25/2009, the ground of rejection set forth in the office action mailed 6/15/2009 has been withdrawn. However, the patentability of the claimed invention is still barred in view of the newly discovered reference Narayan (U.S. Patent 4,544,763).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Obviousness Rejection I

3. **Claims 1-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayan (U.S. Patent 4,544,763), as evidenced by Narayan (U.S. Patent 4,228,095), in view of Hippold et al (2003/0162933).

4. **Regarding claim 1:** Narayan ('763) teaches a method for producing isocyanate-functional prepolymers that have very low amounts of monomeric diisocyanate, said process comprising:

- a. Reacting (i) diisocyanate with (ii) isocyanate-reactive polymer in the presence of (iii) catalyst to form a prepolymer
- b. Stabilizing the prepolymer + catalyst with (iv) benzoyl chloride

5. Wherein (i) comprises asymmetric diisocyanate, such as 2,4'-toluene diisocyanate (TDI) and 2,4'-diphenylmethane diisocyanate (MDI) (Abstract; col 2 lines 11-22; col 4 lines 5-18).

6. It should be noted that benzoyl chloride is inherently an organo-metallic catalyst deactivator. Evidence for this position is provided by column 2 lines 13-16 and column 3 lines 30-31 of Narayan ('095) – which teaches benzoyl chloride as a suitable deactivator dibutyltin dilaurate catalyst. Still, Narayan ('763) fails to teach or suggest a distillation step, as well as conducting said distillation step only after the deactivation of the catalyst.

7. Hippold et al also teach isocyanate-terminated prepolymers that are the reaction product of (i) TDI and/or MDI and (ii) isocyanate reactive polymer (Abstract; paragraph [0026]). The prepolymer preferably exhibits monomeric diisocyanate contents as low as 0.1 wt%, which is obtained by distilling off excess monomers after the formation of the prepolymer is completed (Paragraph [0025]). Therefore, it would be obvious to subject the prepolymer of Narayan ('763) to the same distillation step of Hippold et al since Narayan ('763) also requires low monomeric diisocyanate contents, and the removal step insures almost all excess monomeric diisocyanate is removed from the prepolymer.

8. Moreover, while Hippold et al is silent with respect to a catalyst deactivation step prior to the distillation step, it still would be obvious to distill off the excess monomer only after the catalyst of Narayan has been deactivated because this ensures that no further unwanted reactions occur during the distillation step. Narayan ('763) terminates the prepolymer forming reaction once the desired NCO content is obtained. If Narayan were to distill the reaction system before deactivating the catalyst, the system may continue to react during the distillation, and therefore the desired NCO content may be lost.

9. **Regarding claims 2 and 3:** The diisocyanate of Narayan ('763) is 2,4-TDI and 2,4'-MDI.

10. **Regarding claim 4:** The catalyst of Narayan is dibutyltin dilaurate – which contains a tin (IVb) atom.

11. **Regarding claims 5-8:** Dibutyltin dilaurate has a carboxylate anion chelating system.

12. **Regarding claim 9:** Narayan ('763) takes care to insure the reaction systems of examples 3-6 are in a single phase by heating at elevated temperatures along with prolonged mixing. Thus one of ordinary skill would reasonably expect the catalyst to also be in the same phase as the reactants, and therefore be homogenous.

13. **Regarding claims 10 and 11:** As discussed in paragraphs 4-6 of the instant rejection, Narayan ('763) teaches that after the prepolymer production is completed, said prepolymer is stabilized by including catalyst deactivator – i.e. Narayan ('763) suggest that it is helpful to reduce the catalytic activity when the catalyst is no longer needed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to utilize a heterogeneous catalyst/catalyst on a support since it would allow the user to more easily removed said catalyst from the reaction system after the formation of the prepolymer.

Obviousness Rejection II

14. **Claims 12-15 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayan ('763), in view of Hippold et al (2003/0162933), Narayan ('095), and Duffy et al (U.S. Patent 5,382,602).

15. **Regarding claims 12-15 and 17:** As discussed in paragraphs 4-6 of the instant rejection, Narayan ('763) in view of Hippold et al render obvious a method for producing prepolymers in the presence of dibutyltin dilaurate catalyst, wherein said catalyst is deactivated with benzoyl chloride after the prepolymer production is completed. However, Narayan ('763) fails to teach other deactivators suitable for dibutyltin dilaurate catalyst.

16. Nevertheless, column 2 lines 14-15 of Narayan ('095) and column 4 lines 38-46 of Duffy et al teach that dibutyltin dilaurate can also be deactivated with compounds such as hydrochloric acid and tartaric acid. Therefore, it would have also been obvious to utilize the deactivators of Narayan ('095) and Duffy et al since they are disclosed as being suitable for deactivating dibutyltin dilaurate, and it is prima facie obvious to add a known ingredient for its known function. *In re Linder* 173 USPQ 356; *In re Dial et al* 140 USPQ 244.

Obviousness Rejection III

17. **Claim 16** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayan ('763), as evidenced by Narayan ('095), in view of Hippold et al (2003/0162933) and Marans et al (U.S. Patent 4,061,662).

18. **Regarding claim 16:** As discussed in paragraphs 4-6 of the instant rejection, Narayan ('763) in view of Hippold et al render obvious a process for producing isocyanate-terminated

prepolymers having as little as 0.1 wt% of monomeric diisocyanate present. However, Narayan ('763) fails to teach whether the prepolymer is 'perfect' - i.e. ABA structure.

19. Still, it would have been obvious to expect said prepolymers of Narayan ('763) to be 'perfect' since one of ordinary skill would understand that isocyanate-group in the 2-position on the 2,4-TDI is greatly hindered by a methyl group. This causes the hydroxyl-functional polymer to only react with the unhindered isocyanate group (in the 4-position) leaving the hindered isocyanate group unconsumed. This is reinforced by Marans et al on column 3 lines 55+ and column 4 lines 1-11, which shows that when 2,4-TDI is reacted with hydroxyl-functional polymer at temperatures of about 60°C, only the unhindered isocyanate group is consumed – 60°C is the same temperature used in examples 4-6 of Narayan ('763).

20. Moreover, the MDI of Narayan ('763) is added in a large NCO:OH excess, and therefore the remaining hydroxyl groups would be overwhelmed with monomeric isocyanate – this insures the remaining free hydroxyl groups only react with monomeric diisocyanate and therefore produce a ABA prepolymer.

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Specifically, the new grounds of rejection explains how the prior art teaches a process for making isocyanate-prepolymer in the presence of catalyst, wherein that catalyst is deactivated – see paragraphs 4-6 of the instant rejection.

Conclusion

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN J. GILLESPIE whose telephone number is (571)272-2472. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-5:30pm.

23. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

24. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin J Gillespie/
Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/Vasu Jagannathan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796